



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/506,910

07/11/2005

Alexandre Cotarmanac'h

F40.12-0028

6776

27367 7590 10/14/2009
WESTMAN CHAMPLIN & KELLY, P.A.
SUITE 1400
900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402

EXAMINER

CHOKSHI, PINKAL R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2425

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/14/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/506,910	Applicant(s) COTARMANAC'H, ALEXANDRE	
	Examiner PINKAL CHOKSHI	Art Unit 2425	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 July 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/23/2009 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. See the new rejection below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claimed invention does not fall within at least one of four categories of patent eligible subject matter recited in 35 U.S.C. 101 above. Claim 16 is claiming a stream of data or signal per se.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 18-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent 7,000,245 to Pierre (hereafter referenced as Pierre) in view of US Patent 6,205,140 to Putzolu (hereafter referenced as Putzolu) and US PG Pub 2002/0071434 to Furukawa (hereafter referenced as Furukawa).

Regarding **claim 18**, “a server for data designed to be transmitted to at least one terminal” reads on the data stream that is broadcast from a broadcast station to a receiving station (abstract and col.2, lines 61-63) disclosed by Pierre and represented in Fig. 1.

As to “in the form of at least one data stream made of stream units transmitted independently from each other” Pierre discloses (col.5, lines 42-45) that the data stream transmitted to receiver comprises data objects as represented in Fig. 2.

As to “wherein at least some of said stream units include at least one pointer that points to at least one other stream unit of said stream or of another stream that may have been received previously in the terminal, called a required previous unit” Pierre discloses (col.6, lines 30-49) that the data objects in a stream contain references (pointers) to data objects in other stream, where some

of the data object of the other stream is previously received and stored in the receiver as represented in Fig. 3.

Pierre meets all the limitations of the claim except “wherein said pointer is a dependency pointer, the dependency pointer being included in a dependency descriptor of said stream unit, said dependency descriptor describing said dependency pointer.” However, Putzolu discloses (col.3, lines 33-35) that the packet includes header, stream descriptor and payload. As represented in Fig. 2 (element 150), dependency pointer included in a packet holds a certain bits length (col.5, lines 61-62). Putzolu further discloses (col.3, lines 64-65) that the stream descriptor of a packet includes dependency information as represented in Fig. 2. Putzolu also discloses (col.5, lines 1-4, 28-33, 38-44) that the dependency information included in the descriptor defines a list of media streams needed for delivering the given media stream. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pierre’s system by using descriptor of stream unit for pointer as taught by Putzolu in order to describe dependencies among the data packets so the arrangement of a media presentation to be varied in response to information that becomes available as the presentation progresses (col.1, lines 55-60).

Combination of Pierre and Putzolu meets all the limitations of the claim except “the dependency pointer being distinct from any sequence number said stream unit may have.” However, Furukawa discloses (§0063) that the MPEG transport stream transmitted to an apparatus includes different fields for a

sequence number and a pointer as represented in Fig. 7. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pierre and Putzolu's systems by using pointer and sequence number as distinct fields as taught by Furukawa in order to use both fields for separate stream functions.

Regarding **claim 19**, "a terminal that can receive at least one data stream" reads on the data stream that is broadcast to a receiving station (abstract and col.2, lines 61-63) disclosed by Pierre and represented in Fig. 1.

As to "the data stream is made of steam units transmitted independently one from the other" Pierre discloses (col.5, lines 42-45) that the data stream transmitted to receiver comprises data objects as represented in Fig. 2.

As to "wherein at least some of said stream units include at least one pointer that points to at least one other stream unit of said stream or of another stream that may have been received previously in the terminal, called a required previous unit" Pierre discloses (col.6, lines 30-49) that the data objects in a stream contain references (pointers) to data objects in other stream, where some of the data object of the other stream is previously received and stored in the receiver as represented in Fig. 3.

Pierre meets all the limitations of the claim except "wherein said pointer is a dependency pointer, the dependency pointer being included in a dependency descriptor of said stream unit, said dependency descriptor describing said

dependency pointer.” However, Putzolu discloses (col.3, lines 33-35) that the packet includes header, stream descriptor and payload. As represented in Fig. 2 (element 150), dependency pointer included in a packet holds a certain bits length (col.5, lines 61-62). Putzolu further discloses (col.3, lines 64-65) that the stream descriptor of a packet includes dependency information as represented in Fig. 2. Putzolu also discloses (col.5, lines 1-4, 28-33, 38-44) that the dependency information included in the descriptor defines a list of media streams needed for delivering the given media stream. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pierre’s system by using descriptor of stream unit for pointer as taught by Putzolu in order to describe dependencies among the data packets so the arrangement of a media presentation to be varied in response to information that becomes available as the presentation progresses (col.1, lines 55-60).

Combination of Pierre and Putzolu meets all the limitations of the claim except “the dependency pointer being distinct from any sequence number said stream unit may have.” However, Furukawa discloses (¶0063) that the MPEG transport stream transmitted to an apparatus includes different fields for a sequence number and a pointer as represented in Fig. 7. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pierre and Putzolu’s systems by using pointer and sequence number as distinct fields as taught by Furukawa in order to use both fields for separate stream functions.

Regarding **claim 20**, “a reception procedure comprising: receiving at least one data stream” reads on the data stream that is broadcast to a receiving station (abstract and col.2, lines 61-63) disclosed by Pierre and represented in Fig. 1.

As to “at least one stream is made of steam units transmitted independently one from the other” Pierre discloses (col.5, lines 42-45) that the data stream transmitted to receiver comprises data objects as represented in Fig. 2.

As to “wherein at least some of said stream units include at least one pointer that points to at least one other stream unit of said stream or of another stream that may have been received previously in a terminal, called a required previous unit” Pierre discloses (col.6, lines 30-49) that the data objects in a stream contain references (pointers) to data objects in other stream, where some of the data object of the other stream is previously received and stored in the receiver as represented in Fig. 3.

Pierre meets all the limitations of the claim except “wherein said pointer is a dependency pointer, the dependency pointer being included in a dependency descriptor of said stream unit, said dependency descriptor describing said dependency pointer.” However, Putzolu discloses (col.3, lines 33-35) that the packet includes header, stream descriptor and payload. As represented in Fig. 2 (element 150), dependency pointer included in a packet holds a certain bits

length (col.5, lines 61-62). Putzolu further discloses (col.3, lines 64-65) that the stream descriptor of a packet includes dependency information as represented in Fig. 2. Putzolu also discloses (col.5, lines 1-4, 28-33, 38-44) that the dependency information included in the descriptor defines a list of media streams needed for delivering the given media stream. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pierre's system by using descriptor of stream unit for pointer as taught by Putzolu in order to describe dependencies among the data packets so the arrangement of a media presentation to be varied in response to information that becomes available as the presentation progresses (col.1, lines 55-60).

Combination of Pierre and Putzolu meets all the limitations of the claim except "the dependency pointer being distinct from any sequence number said stream unit may have." However, Furukawa discloses (§0063) that the MPEG transport stream transmitted to an apparatus includes different fields for a sequence number and a pointer as represented in Fig. 7. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pierre and Putzolu's systems by using pointer and sequence number as distinct fields as taught by Furukawa in order to use both fields for separate stream functions.

6. **Claims 1-17, 21, and 22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pierre in view of Putzolu and Furukawa as applied to claims 18-20

Art Unit: 2425

above, and further in view of US PG Pub 2001/0027468 to Okura (hereafter referenced as Okura).

Regarding **claim 1**, “transmission procedure comprising: generating at least one data stream for transmission to at least one terminal and transmitting the at least one data stream to the at least one terminal” reads on the data stream that is broadcast to a receiving station (abstract and col.2, lines 61-63) disclosed by Pierre and represented in Fig. 1.

As to “each of said stream or streams being made of stream units” Pierre discloses (col.5, lines 42-45) that the data stream transmitted to receiver comprises data objects as represented in Fig. 2.

As to “wherein at least some of said stream units include at least one pointer that points to at least one other stream unit of said stream or of another stream that may have been received previously in the terminal, called a required previous unit” Pierre discloses (col.6, lines 30-49) that the data objects in a stream contain references (pointers) to data objects in other stream, where some of the data object of the other stream is previously received and stored in the receiver as represented in Fig. 3.

Pierre meets all the limitations of the claim except “wherein said pointer is a dependency pointer, the dependency pointer being included in a dependency descriptor of said stream unit, said dependency descriptor describing said dependency pointer.” However, Putzolu discloses (col.3, lines 33-35) that the packet includes header, stream descriptor and payload. As represented in Fig. 2

Art Unit: 2425

(element 150), dependency pointer included in a packet holds a certain bits length (col.5, lines 61-62). Putzolu further discloses (col.3, lines 64-65) that the stream descriptor of a packet includes dependency information as represented in Fig. 2. Putzolu also discloses (col.5, lines 1-4, 28-33, 38-44) that the dependency information included in the descriptor defines a list of media streams needed for delivering the given media stream. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pierre's system by using descriptor of stream unit for pointer as taught by Putzolu in order to describe dependencies among the data packets so the arrangement of a media presentation to be varied in response to information that becomes available as the presentation progresses (col.1, lines 55-60).

Combination of Pierre and Putzolu meets all the limitations of the claim except "the dependency pointer being distinct from any sequence number said stream unit may have." However, Furukawa discloses (§0063) that the MPEG transport stream transmitted to an apparatus includes different fields for a sequence number and a pointer as represented in Fig. 7. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pierre and Putzolu's systems by using pointer and sequence number as distinct fields as taught by Furukawa in order to use both fields for separate stream functions.

Combination of Pierre, Putzolu, and Furukawa meets all the limitations of the claim except "so that processing of said stream unit is not performed in said

Art Unit: 2425

terminal if the required previous unit or units have not been received.” However, Okura discloses (¶0024) that control unit, based on the scene description information, determines whether to process the stream. Okura further discloses (¶0129) that the system determines if the data is missing, and then it reads data from storage portion. Okura further discloses (¶0010, ¶0029, and ¶0113) that program file is not allowed to have data missing and it must be fully received by receiving side. If the check unit determines that sequence numbers are not in order then it means a packet is missing and the process is ended as represented in Fig. 10. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pierre, Putzolu, and Furukawa’s systems by not processing the stream unit when there is an abnormality as taught by Okura in order to recover lost data and prevent it from being missing (¶0013, ¶0020).

Regarding **claim 2**, “transmission procedure wherein the procedure includes the transmission of at least two data streams that are transmitted independently” Pierre discloses (col.6, lines 50-52) that the programs are transmitted to the receiving station on a different channel as represented in Fig. 3.

As to “one stream unit of a first stream pointing to at least one required previous unit of at least a second stream, in which said stream unit of the first stream includes enrichment data of the data contained in the second stream(s)”

Art Unit: 2425

Pierre discloses (col.6, lines 30-49) that the data object in one stream contain references to data objects in other streams as represented in Fig. 3. Pierre further discloses (col.6, 30-49; col.7, lines 53-56) that the stream includes identifying information that contain references to data objects in other stream units.

Regarding **claim 3**, "transmission procedure wherein said data streams correspond to different hierarchical levels of hierarchical encoding, the processing of a stream unit of a given hierarchical level is only performed if the stream units of the corresponding lower hierarchical levels have been received" Putzolu discloses (col.5, lines 4-8, 40-44) that the media streams have a value where it's matched with a layer of an hierarchically encoded video stream which requires based layer media stream in order to be successfully delivered. In addition, same motivation is used as rejection to claim 1.

Regarding **claim 4**, "transmission procedure wherein this stream unit points to at least one previous unit defining a sequence of required previous units" Putzolu discloses (col.4, lines 45-48; col.10, lines 42-46) that the packet includes the sequence numbers indicating previous data packets. In addition, same motivation is used as rejection to claim 1.

Regarding **claim 5**, “transmission procedure wherein at least one of said pointers allows recovering at least one required previous unit that includes the data allowing decoding and/or decrypting of the considered stream unit” Pierre discloses (col.5, lines 15-19) that the data streams transmitted to receiver is decoded by the receiver.

Regarding **claim 6**, “transmission procedure wherein said required previous unit or units include data that allows a terminal to decide whether the data of a considered stream unit must be decoded and/or decrypted, and then displayed after decoding” Pierre discloses (col.6, lines 15-20; col.7, lines 47-50) that the receiving station determines the properties associated with the stream and generate signals to display on television.

Regarding **claim 7**, “transmission procedure wherein at least one of said pointers point to data that can be known by said terminal, so that the latter can decide on its capacity or incapacity to process the corresponding stream unit” Okura discloses (§0026) that the transmission system that transmits control information pointing the object data and scene information with each other, where process portion unit determines whether to use the default scene information to modify corresponding stream information for output. In addition, same motivation is used as rejection to claim 1.

Regarding **claim 8**, “transmission procedure wherein at least one of said stream units includes at least one pointer pointing to at least one stream unit of said stream or another stream that may be subsequently received” Pierre discloses (col.9, lines 7-36) that the stream that points to another stream that references to live content are received at the later time when it’s being played back as represented in Fig. 6.

Regarding **claim 9**, “transmission procedure wherein said stream unit or units that can be subsequently received posses a marker that allows linking with said pointer(s)” Okura discloses (§0164) that the data packet in transmission system has a time stamp information and based on this information, a correspondence between video, audio and other data are uniquely determined. In addition, same motivation is used as rejection to claim 1.

Regarding **claim 10**, “transmission procedure wherein the pointers of at least two similar stream units transmitted at distinct times point to the same stream unit that can be subsequently received” Okura discloses (§0008) that the multiple streams are transmitted via different routes and protocols to receiving device. In addition, same motivation is used as rejection to claim 1.

Regarding **claim 11**, “transmission procedure wherein the procedure implements an indicator that specifies the role of the pointer(s) from among two

Art Unit: 2425

of the roles belonging to the groups that include: Designation of at least one previous stream unit that must be decoded to allow taking into account the considered stream unit” Okura discloses (§0151) that the checking portion uses the data as well as previous data associated with the stream from the storage portions to generate this data to decoder which decodes it and then displayed on device.

As to “designation of at least one previous stream unit that includes the data necessary for decoding and/or decrypting the considered stream unit, and/or of a reference to a status of the protection system” Okura discloses (§0123) that the multiplexer outputs all streams to decoder which decodes the packet.

As to “designation of at least one subsequent stream unit” Okura discloses (§0125) that the packet header (stream) has a sequence number and each sequence number has a successive value for packet. Okura further discloses (§0029) that when the scene does not have a subsequent sequence number, system determines that there is an abnormality. In addition, same motivation is used as rejection to claim 1.

Regarding **claim 12**, “transmission procedure wherein at least some of said stream units include a dependency descriptor, which defines said role” Okura discloses (§0006) that the scene description and streams are associated

Art Unit: 2425

with each other by an object descriptor to control information. In addition, same motivation is used as rejection to claim 1.

Regarding **claim 13**, “transmission procedure wherein at least some of said stream units include a dependency marker that allows its identification as a required previous unit” Pierre discloses (col.5, lines 42-60; col.7, lines 34-37) that the information provided in the stream identifies references to other stream that can be identified the receiving station.

Regarding **claim 14**, “transmission procedure wherein at least some of said stream units include an identification marker of said stream unit in said stream” Pierre discloses (col.6, lines 36-38) that the stream includes ID marker as represented in Fig. 3 (element 31).

Regarding **claim 15**, “transmission procedure wherein the procedure is implemented at the synchronization level so that no previous processing of a received stream unit is necessary” Okura discloses (¶0156) that the data stream and the related data stream are synchronized with each other based on the time stamp. In addition, same motivation is used as rejection to claim 1.

Regarding **claim 16**, “a stream of data transmitted according to the transmission procedure” Pierre discloses (col.3, lines 31-33) that a stream of data is transmitted to a receiving station.

Regarding **claim 17**, “a method comprising: producing a stream of data and transmitting the stream to the at least one terminal” reads on the data stream that is broadcast to a receiving station (abstract and col.2, lines 61-63) disclosed by Pierre and represented in Fig. 1.

As to “wherein the stream is made of steam units transmitted independently one from the other” Pierre discloses (col.5, lines 42-45) that the data stream transmitted to receiver comprises data objects as represented in Fig. 2.

As to “wherein at least some of said stream units include at least one pointer that points to at least one other stream unit of said stream or of another stream that may have been received previously in the terminal, called a required previous unit” Pierre discloses (col.6, lines 30-49) that the data objects in a stream contain references (pointers) to data objects in other stream, where some of the data object of the other stream is previously received and stored in the receiver as represented in Fig. 3.

Pierre meets all the limitations of the claim except “wherein said pointer is a dependency pointer, the dependency pointer being included in a dependency descriptor of said stream unit, said dependency descriptor describing said

Art Unit: 2425

dependency pointer.” However, Putzolu discloses (col.3, lines 33-35) that the packet includes header, stream descriptor and payload. As represented in Fig. 2 (element 150), dependency pointer included in a packet holds a certain bits length (col.5, lines 61-62). Putzolu further discloses (col.3, lines 64-65) that the stream descriptor of a packet includes dependency information as represented in Fig. 2. Putzolu also discloses (col.5, lines 1-4, 28-33, 38-44) that the dependency information included in the descriptor defines a list of media streams needed for delivering the given media stream. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pierre’s system by using descriptor of stream unit for pointer as taught by Putzolu in order to describe dependencies among the data packets so the arrangement of a media presentation to be varied in response to information that becomes available as the presentation progresses (col.1, lines 55-60).

Combination of Pierre and Putzolu meets all the limitations of the claim except “the dependency pointer being distinct from any sequence number said stream unit may have.” However, Furukawa discloses (¶0063) that the MPEG transport stream transmitted to an apparatus includes different fields for a sequence number and a pointer as represented in Fig. 7. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pierre and Putzolu’s systems by using pointer and sequence number as distinct fields as taught by Furukawa in order to use both fields for separate stream functions.

Art Unit: 2425

Combination of Pierre, Putzolu, and Furukawa meets all the limitations of the claim except “so that processing of said stream unit is not performed in said terminal if the required previous unit or units have not been received.” However, Okura discloses (¶¶0024) that control unit, based on the scene description information, determines whether to process the stream. Okura further discloses (¶¶0129) that the system determines if the data is missing, and then it reads data from storage portion. Okura further discloses (¶¶0010, ¶¶0029, and ¶¶0113) that program file is not allowed to have data missing and it must be fully received by receiving side. If the check unit determines that sequence numbers are not in order then it means a packet is missing and the process is ended as represented in Fig. 10. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to modify Pierre, Putzolu, and Furukawa's systems by not processing the stream unit when there is an abnormality as taught by Okura in order to recover lost data and prevent it from being missing (¶¶0013, ¶¶0020).

Regarding **claim 21**, “reception procedure wherein at least one of said pointers points to at least one stream unit of said stream or another stream that may have been received previously in a terminal, called required previous unit” Okura discloses (¶¶0125) that the packet header (stream) has a sequence number and each sequence number has a successive value for packet. Okura

Art Unit: 2425

further discloses (§0029) that when the scene does not have a successive sequence number, system determines that there is an abnormality.

As to "it includes the following stages: analysing said pointer(s) of a stream unit and processing said stream unit if the required previous unit or units are received" Okura discloses (§0023) that the control system analyzes and resolves the error which controls the process portion to scene information to resolve the error and process the streams. In addition, same motivation is used as rejection to claim 20.

Regarding **claim 22**, "the transmission procedure comprising a step of using said transmission procedure in one of the applications belonging to the group consisting of: systematic broadcasting of a message before accessing a program selected by the user; conditional access at a specific quality level and/or at a specific option of a program and interactive television" Pierre discloses (col.1, lines 13-16) that the method is used in an interactive television system.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PINKAL CHOKSHI whose telephone number is (571) 270-3317. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8 - 5 pm (Alt. Friday off).

Art Unit: 2425

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Pendleton can be reached on 571-272-7527. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Pinkal Chokshi/
Examiner, Art Unit 2425

/Brian T. Pendleton/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2425